

AD-A084 344

RAND CORP SANTA MONICA CA  
SPATIAL COGNITION AND REASONING.(U)  
APR 80 P W THORNDYKE

F/6 5/10

UNCLASSIFIED

RAND/N-1333-ONR

N00014-78-C-0042

NL

1 of 1  
AD  
CONTINUE



END  
DATE  
FILMED  
6-80  
DTIC

ADA084344

Prepared For

The OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

DTIC  
SECRET

SECRET

80 5 19 000

The Rand Publications Series: The Report is the principal publication documenting and transmitting Rand's major research findings and final research results. The Rand Note reports other outputs of sponsored research for general distribution. Publications of The Rand Corporation do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the sponsors of Rand research.

Published by The Rand Corporation

## A RAND NOTE

SPATIAL COGNITION AND REASONING

Perry W. Thorndyke

April 1980

N-1333-ONR

Prepared For

The Office of Naval Research



APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER <b>14</b> RAND N-1333-ONR	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A084344	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) <b>6</b> SPATIAL COGNITION AND REASONING		5. TYPE OF REPORT & SERIES COVERED <b>9</b> Interim rept.
6. AUTHOR(s) <b>10</b> Perry W. Thorndyke		7. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) <b>15</b> N00014-78-C-0042		
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS The Rand Corporation 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California 90406		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Personnel and Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research (Code 458) Arlington, VA 22217		12. REPORT DATE <b>11</b> Apr 80
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 24
15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)  Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)  No Restrictions		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Psychology                      Cognition Reasoning Thinking Concept Formation		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)  See Reverse Side		

296600      giv

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

↙  
This paper summarizes several cognitive studies of spatial knowledge processing. The studies investigated the types of representation of spatial knowledge, the techniques individuals use to acquire knowledge from maps, and the differences between the knowledge acquired from maps and navigational experience. Three major conclusions emerge from these studies: (1) People encode several types of spatial knowledge in memory, including images of physical objects, memory of actions and procedures, symbolic abstractions of the environment (e. g., names, distances), and spatial maps; (2) Different types of spatial knowledge are optimal for different tasks (e. g., orienting oneself, estimating distances, reconstructing spatial relations among distant objects); (3) Individuals vary in their strategies and abilities for acquiring spatial knowledge.

21                      220

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

PREFACE

This Note documents a paper presented at a conference on "Cognition, Social Behavior, and the Environment," held at Vanderbilt University in May 1979. The reported research was supported by the Office of the Director of Personnel and Training Research Programs, Psychological Sciences Division, Office of Naval Research, under Contract No. N00014-78-C-0042 with The Rand Corporation.

Accession For	
NILS - C. 1. 1. 1.	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DDO PAF	<input type="checkbox"/>
Univ. of Cal.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Johns Hopkins	<input type="checkbox"/>
By _____	
Date _____	
Test	_____
A	_____

### SUMMARY

Cognitive approaches to human spatial learning and reasoning differ from the traditional environmental approach. Environmental psychologists typically relate demographic and social variables to one's perception of the environment. In contrast, cognitive psychologists focus on the representation of spatial knowledge in memory and the processes used to acquire, encode, and reason with that knowledge. This paper summarizes several cognitive studies of spatial knowledge processing. The studies investigated the types of representation of spatial knowledge, the techniques individuals use to acquire knowledge from maps, and the differences between the knowledge acquired from maps and navigational experience. Three major conclusions emerge from these studies: (1) People encode several types of spatial knowledge in memory, including images of physical objects, memory of actions and procedures, symbolic abstractions of the environment (e.g., names, distances), and spatial maps. (2) Different types of spatial knowledge are optimal for different tasks (e.g., orienting oneself, estimating distances, reconstructing spatial relations among distant objects). (3) Individuals vary in their strategies and abilities for acquiring spatial knowledge.



SPATIAL COGNITION AND REASONING

During the second day of this conference, I was stopped while walking across the Vanderbilt campus by a couple who asked if I could direct them to the Holiday Inn. Although I was generally unfamiliar with the campus and its environs, I had walked between the Holiday Inn and the conference hall three times during the previous two days. Consequently, I was able to confidently point in the direction of the hotel and explain to them the best route to take in order to walk there.

This incident gave me particular satisfaction because I was able to analyze and understand my mundane (though by no means simple) behavior in that situation in terms of my research on spatial cognition, which, not coincidentally, is the topic of this paper. I use the term cognition here not in its typical sense (as synonymous with "thinking"), but in its primary literal sense, which is the process of acquiring new knowledge.[1] Thus, as the title of this paper indicates, I am concerned with how people acquire knowledge of their environment and use that knowledge to perform tasks such as, in the example above, orienting oneself in the environment and giving directions.

Situations in which we acquire new spatial knowledge or use what we know to reason are ubiquitous in our lives. They range all the way from learning to get around in a new locale by acquiring knowledge

---

[1] I am grateful to Frederick Hayes-Roth for pointing out this distinction.

about the names and locations of objects in the environment to reading a map to answer particular questions about the world (e.g., What's the name of that street? Where's the Pasadena Civic Center?) People also use the knowledge they acquire to perform such tasks as estimating distances between points or deciding how to get from one location to another by the shortest route.

Spatial knowledge comes from a variety of sources. A frequent source of knowledge is a map, which provides a concise symbolism for a vast amount of geographic information, and so is particularly useful for finding information or answering questions rapidly. But most typically, people acquire knowledge from navigational experience. They travel through the world, observe objects, locations, and routes, encode that information in memory, and integrate it all into a coherent representation of the world. In this paper I will postulate some of the types of spatial knowledge that people have in memory, how they acquire that knowledge, and how particular knowledge types constrain performance on common spatial reasoning tasks.

The question of how people perceive and respond to their spatial environment has concerned researchers from a wide range of disciplines, including geography, psychology, architecture, urban planning, and sociology. With the exception of a few isolated early studies of spatial orientation (e.g., Trowbridge, 1913; Witkin, 1946; Tolman, 1948), most of the psychological research on spatial cognition and reasoning has been conducted within the past twenty years. The bulk of this research has been in the area of environmental psychology (Lynch, 1960; Downs & Stea, 1973, 1977; Proshansky, Ittelson, & Rivlin, 1970; Moore & Golledge, 1976; Golledge & Rushton, 1976).

However, as evidenced by the contributions of Chase and Clayton to this volume and by other recent articles in the literature (e.g., Stevens & Coupe, 1978; Allen, Siegel, & Rosinski, 1978; Kozlowski & Bryant, 1977; Thorndyke & Stasz, 1980), cognitive and experimental psychologists have begun to study this area of human behavior too.

The recent "cognitive" approaches to human spatial reasoning (including the present paper) differ somewhat from the traditional "environmental" approach. In both approaches, researchers are concerned with what types of spatial knowledge people acquire and, to some extent, how that knowledge is represented in memory. Such knowledge includes the identities of various geographic features (e.g., landmarks, paths or routes, boundaries, and regions), the locations of these features in the environment, the distances among them, and the knowledge necessary to orient oneself in the environment. Typically, environmental psychologists focus on how people derive such spatial knowledge from their day-to-day experiences. Such studies frequently employ correlational methods to relate personal variables such as socio-economic status, mobility, attitudes, and preferences to individuals' environmental knowledge. Cognitive psychologists, in contrast, are considering maps, in addition to environmental experience, as sources of spatial knowledge. Further, instead of considering social variables as determinants of individual differences in spatial knowledge, cognitive psychologists are analyzing differences in spatial knowledge in terms of the processes individuals use to acquire, manipulate, encode, and retrieve information. Chase's contribution to this volume illustrates this approach. Such process analyses have also led cognitive researchers to consider the procedures

by which people use their spatial knowledge to perform complex tasks such as memorizing maps, estimating distances, and selecting optimal routes between points.

The remainder of this paper provides an overview to the approach my colleagues Barbara Hayes-Roth and Cathleen Stasz and I have been taking to the study of human spatial cognition. The paper is organized around three main points that will be illustrated and defended with a variety of formal and informal data. These points are:

- (1) People encode several types of spatial knowledge in memory.
- (2) Different types of spatial knowledge are optimal for different tasks.
- (3) Individuals vary in their strategies and abilities for acquiring spatial knowledge.

The following sections treat each of these propositions in more detail.

#### TYPES OF SPATIAL KNOWLEDGE

Our knowledge of the surrounding world comes from a variety of sources, including maps, movies and photographs, verbal descriptions, and direct perception during navigation. It seems reasonable, then, to suppose that a person's spatial knowledge is a collection of memories that may include images of geographic features, sequences of actions that define specific routes, images (perhaps fuzzy) of area maps, and individual facts about particular objects or relationships (e.g., the distance from San Francisco to Los Angeles is approximately

400 miles). Siegel and White (1975) have postulated three fundamental types of spatial knowledge: memory for landmarks (prominent geographic features), route representations (action sequences that connect separate locations), and configural representations (map-like, global organizations of object and route relationships). A variety of other researchers, using different terminologies, have made similar distinctions and have argued that a person's knowledge typically progresses from landmark to route to configural representations (Piaget, Inhelder, & Szeminska, 1960; Shemyakin, 1962; Appleyard, 1969, 1970; Siegel, Kirasic, & Kail, 1978).

I view these distinctions as defining categories of knowledge types, which I will call landmark knowledge, procedural knowledge (knowledge of procedures for navigating between points), and survey knowledge (map-like configurations of points). Within these categories, I think it is possible to further refine the distinctions to capture differences in how detailed the knowledge is, how it is associated with related knowledge, and the form in which it is represented. Table 1 summarizes these knowledge types.

The different knowledge types may be thought of as stages in the representation of spatial knowledge. Like Clayton (in this volume), I do not think that the acquisition of knowledge necessarily follows a particular linear progression through these stages. Rather, people typically seem to have knowledge of each type about different portions of their environment. Exactly which stage best characterizes a person's knowledge depends on such factors as the extent of their navigational experience in the environment, the regularity of the geographic features in the environment, the person's motivation, whether

Table 1  
TYPES OF SPATIAL KNOWLEDGE

<u>Knowledge Category</u>	<u>Form of the Memory Representation</u>
Landmark ----->	Perceptual Icons
Procedure ----->	{ Unordered Productions
	{ Ordered Productions
Survey ----->	{ Symbolic Abstractions
	{ Schematized Maps
	{ Detailed Maps

or not the person has studied a map of the environment, and so on. Each of these knowledge types is described in the following paragraphs.

1. Perceptual Icons. The first type of knowledge is the memory of familiar, previously experienced locations. Such knowledge may be thought of as perceptual icons. People most typically acquire these visual memories when first encountering a new environment, such as when visiting a new city or a new area of a familiar city. As they travel through the region, they notice various objects and encode perceptual images that capture the visual scene. Repeated experience leads to the accumulation of a data base of these recognizable images of the area and their association with certain people, goals, times, and so on. Thus, people who have spent some time in a city can look through a set of photographs and identify which objects they have seen

and the names of certain buildings and locations. One might acquire these memories independently of knowledge of the relative locations of the objects in the region or of the routes connecting them.

2. Unordered productions. Most navigation behavior is goal-directed; that is, people usually travel with a destination in mind. In novel environments, people begin to acquire route knowledge by associating with their perceptual icons behaviors they perform in order to reach a certain destination. That is, they progress from a purely visual memory to a behavioral memory that associates images and actions. Such associations are like production rules, or situation-action pairs of the form "if my destination is X and I am at recognizable location Y, then perform action Z." Clayton (in this volume) refers to this type of knowledge as memory for actions in context. So, for example, if I'm traveling in Los Angeles, my destination is The Rand Corporation, and my current view when I look around includes Synanon on my left, then I know I should turn right. Along the same route, another view I might have is an intersection with a traffic signal and the Pacific Shore Hotel on the left. In this situation, I know I should turn left. People frequently acquire sets of such productions as a basis for navigating in an unfamiliar region using only memory of previous route traversals. For any particular route the individual productions are independent in that they do not represent the order or occurrence along the route, nor is there any explicit association among them. Therefore, in Table 1 knowledge of this type is referred to as unordered productions.

It is not unusual for a person to have extensive route knowledge of an environment comprising only these unintegrated route components. An acquaintance, MC, who is a native of Los Angeles, illustrates this point nicely. When asked to give directions for a moderately complex but frequently traveled route, she often replies, "I can't tell you how to get there, but I can take you there." This distinction between the ability to navigate and the ability to give directions potentially stems from two properties of the memory representation of unordered productions. First, the productions MC uses for navigation are independent and are organized in memory in no particular sequential order. So while MC can retrieve the appropriate action associated with each of the choice points, she cannot retrieve the order in which she will arrive at the points. Thus, once she arrives at a certain choice point, she knows the appropriate action to perform but she cannot regenerate the sequence of choice points. A second reason for MC's inability to give directions may be an inability to recall or explain in sufficient detail the visual features of the locations where actions must be performed. Thus, while MC can recognize these locations when she arrives at them, the image of these locations may not be sufficiently strong for her to recall them.

3. Ordered Productions. A related type of procedural knowledge is listed in Table 1 as ordered productions. This knowledge is similar to unordered productions except that order information is represented by associations between productions. So I may know, for example, that when I arrive at Synanon on my way to Rand I should turn right, and that I should next use, say, production P46. P46, in turn, may state that when I arrive at the Pacific Shore Hotel, I should turn



left and then use production P81. Thus, sequential route knowledge is represented as an associative path through a set of individual productions.

4. Symbolic Abstractions. As people become more familiar with the environment, they begin to replace their perceptual icons with symbolic abstractions, or verbal descriptions, of the region. Such symbolic information includes semantic knowledge about location names and approximate locations and distances. This semantic knowledge may supplant the perceptual information that was used previously for navigation. For example, one may learn that Rand is at the corner of Ocean Avenue and Colorado Boulevard so that it is no longer necessary to be able to recognize the building. One needs only to know the name of the corner at which to turn. As such symbolic abstractions replace perceptual icons in people's route descriptions, less attention is given to the visual details of the environment. An interesting but as yet untested hypothesis following from this formulation is that as people become more experienced in an environment, they may actually become less sensitive to perceptual details due to an increasing reliance on symbolic abstractions.

In addition to learning these symbolic labels, people may also learn other abstractions that cannot be perceived directly. Such knowledge includes global spatial knowledge of the environment, such as distances between points and their relative compass bearings or orientations. One might learn these additional facts from a map, from another person, or by computing them from direct knowledge about routes connecting the points. This survey knowledge about relative spatial locations complements the procedural knowledge for navigating

between locations. Thus, one might know not only how to get to Rand from Synanon, but that Synanon is one-half mile due south of Rand.

As the number of facts about spatial location, direction, and distance about a region grows, one builds what may be thought of as a network of spatial relations encoding knowledge about various locations. Stevens and Coupe (1978) have postulated that such knowledge is organized hierarchically in memory and that inferential processes operate on knowledge in the network to produce judgments about spatial relations. For example, one might have the following concepts and relations stored in memory: San Diego IS-PART-OF California, Reno IS-PART-OF Nevada, and California IS-WEST-OF Nevada. Using only this knowledge one might infer, incorrectly, that San Diego is west of Reno. Stevens and Coupe have shown that people commonly make such errors in spatial judgment due to oversimplification of their stored relations.

6. Mental Maps. People also appear to be able to represent and use survey knowledge in imaginal maps. Such a representation may come from a direct encoding of a physical map in some form, such as an image, that preserves the spatial relations among objects on the map, or it may be constructed out of numerous facts derived from direct visual experience in the environment, behavioral memories, and symbolic abstractions. In either case, this type of memory is essentially visual, and it is most easily acquired by individuals who have vivid visual imagery and good visual memory ability (Thorndyke & Stasz, 1980). Further, such imaginal maps can be examined, scanned, and manipulated in the same manner that one would use a physical map (Thorndyke, 1979).

Depending upon the extent of people's knowledge of a region, their mental maps may vary in the amount of detail they contain. Individuals with extensive navigational experience or who have studied a map may possess nearly veridical mental maps. I have referred to these in Table 1 as detailed maps. On the other hand, people frequently possess poorly developed maps containing normalized or oversimplified features. I refer to such maps as schematized maps, because they often contain a simple, prototypical configuration of elements. For example, Los Angeles contains a system of streets and freeways that approximate, although differ in significant ways from, a rectilinear grid. People who have lived in Los Angeles for a short time frequently assume that most streets are parallel or perpendicular to each other. When these individuals draw maps of the city they make relational errors based on these assumptions of regularity. Further, they are surprised to learn that two streets that they had assumed to be parallel actually intersect. Chase (in this volume) illustrates this phenomenon of systematic normalization of spatial relations in students' reconstructions of the map of the Carnegie-Mellon campus.

#### KNOWLEDGE TYPES AND SPATIAL JUDGMENTS

These distinctions among knowledge types become more salient when we consider the estimates and judgments people make using their spatial knowledge. My colleague Barbara Hayes-Roth and I have developed the idea that the different categories of knowledge described above may be optimal for different tasks requiring spatial judgments (Thorndyke & Hayes-Roth, Note 1). Further, the method by which people acquire their knowledge of the environment influences the type of

knowledge that they have and the way in which it is represented. This suggests that people's performance on reasoning tasks depends on the type of experiences that have contributed to their spatial knowledge.

For example, navigational experience in a region leads directly to procedural knowledge. Such knowledge encodes the products of direct experience, including perceptual icons and the actions associated with those icons for traversing particular routes. The knowledge a person acquires directly about the space between two points when navigating comprises a sequence of turns at perceptible angles and the distance, experienced visually and kinesthetically, along each of the legs of the route. It is thus possible to obtain fairly precise local knowledge of the space and the route distance that connects the two points. In addition, as Tolman (1948) has demonstrated with rats and Kozlowski and Bryant (1977) with humans, navigational experience leads relatively rapidly to accurate orientation knowledge (the ability to point to unseen locations in the environment). This latter knowledge is particularly useful for dead reckoning in an unfamiliar environment (i.e., navigating in the general direction of an unseen destination) and for locating oneself in the environment with respect to other objects or locations.

On the other hand, when people study a map of the same region they have immediate access to the configural properties of the region. Because knowledge of the region is spatially rather than sequentially available, the global relationships among objects in the region are readily apparent. These relationships include the relative locations of and euclidean (straight-line) distances between objects in the region. Thus, for example, if one views a map of Los Angeles, it is

easy to discern whether UCLA or USC is closer to Rand and what their relative locations are. However, if one is restricted to driving among those points, the relative euclidean distances and spatial locations may be quite difficult to ascertain.

The city of Boston provides an excellent environment with which to illustrate the distinction between reasoning from procedural knowledge and reasoning from survey knowledge. Because the major geographic boundaries (the harbor and the Charles River) and many of the roads contain irregular curves, it is difficult to induce accurate survey knowledge of the city without looking at a map. In fact, it is not unusual for residents of the city to know how to navigate between points in the city along the best routes (which are not the shortest routes) but not be able to draw a map of the city that properly locates the same points.

Of course, Boston is an extreme example of the difficulty of inducing survey knowledge from navigational experience because of the severe irregularities of the common routes. In many regions, people can learn the spatial relationships well enough to draw a reasonably accurate map after a moderate amount of navigational experience. This illustrates another point about the acquisition of spatial knowledge: the type of knowledge a person has about an environment usually changes over time and with increasing experience in the environment.

In an experiment designed to illustrate these points, Hayes-Roth and I tested various spatial reasoning skills of subjects who had had different learning experiences. We selected as our test environment the two buildings of The Rand Corporation, a maze of offices and hallways that most employees require a few weeks to master. Half of our

subjects learned the Rand environment by memorizing a map of the floor plan of the two buildings. These subjects thus directly encoded a survey representation of the space. The map-learning subjects had never visited Rand prior to the experiment. The other subjects were Rand employees who had obtained their knowledge of the buildings by navigating through the hallways. We manipulated the amount of experience these subjects had had by selecting employees who had worked at Rand for either a month, six months, or 12 to 24 months.

We tested the spatial knowledge of our subjects on orientation, distance estimation, and object location tasks. For the orientation task, we took subjects to various locations in the building and asked them to point in the direction of other, unseen locations. Subjects with only one month of navigation experience performed more accurately on this task than subjects who had memorized the map. Furthermore, the longer individuals had worked at Rand, the more accurate their orientation judgments were. On the object location task, subjects were given a piece of paper with two locations in the building specified and were required to mark the correct location of a particular third location. This test evaluated the accuracy of subjects' survey knowledge of the building. Subjects who had learned the map performed better than all navigation subjects, although the navigation subjects again improved with increasing experience. This result emphasizes the important distinction between the knowledge required to orient oneself in the environment and the knowledge required to reconstruct a survey representation.

Subjects performed two types of distance estimation between various sets of points: route distance (distance along the hallways between the two points) and euclidean distance (straight-line distance). Subjects who had learned the map could readily compute from memory both types of distance; accordingly, they were equally accurate on both types of estimate. However, subjects with one month of navigation experience were far superior in their route estimates and inferior in their euclidean distance estimates. While direct navigational experience led to superior knowledge of the distances along traveled hallways, the survey knowledge subjects obtained from learning the map was optimal for computing euclidean distances. Interestingly, performance on both estimation tasks improved with increasing experience, so that subjects with 12 to 24 months' experience were equally accurate on both types of estimates and superior to the map-learning subjects.

These results illustrate three important points about spatial cognition. First, different spatial reasoning tasks require the use of different types of knowledge. While survey knowledge, for example, may be appropriate for judgments of relative location and distances among objects, it is not optimal for judgments of spatial orientation. Second, different experiences induce, at least initially, different types of knowledge. This was illustrated in the performance differences of subjects who had studied a map and subjects who had traveled throughout the building. Finally, spatial knowledge evolves and changes with extensive navigational experience. While such experience initially produces primarily procedural knowledge, increasing the amount of experience induces survey knowledge perhaps as accurate as that obtained from learning a map.

### INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN SPATIAL COGNITION

While the previous section outlined some general principles of spatial cognition and reasoning, an equally important source of variation in spatial reasoning performance is the spatial processing skill and style of the individual. These individual differences include both the strategies people use and the basic cognitive processing abilities required to perform spatial cognition tasks. One of the first psychologists to study individual differences in the processes of spatial cognition was Trowbridge (1913), who investigated different strategies and individual abilities for orientation. In this section, I will illustrate some of the dimensions of individual variation using the task of map learning, since maps are perhaps our most common source of survey knowledge.

An implicit assumption in the previous discussion of map representations in memory, and one I have defended elsewhere (Thorndyke, 1979), is that learning a map entails the creation of a visual representation in memory. Creating a visual representation of a display as complex as a typical map depends both on learnable strategies for focusing attention on the display and organizing the visual field, and on more stable, fundamental skills, such as encoding and manipulating visual information in mental images. Cathleen Stasz and I, in a series of experimental studies (Thorndyke & Stasz, in press), have been investigating the predictability of people's success at learning a map from their study strategies and spatial abilities.

Initially, we gave subjects a map to learn containing both spatial information (e.g., road patterns, rivers, building locations) and verbal information (named objects and locations). On each of six



study/recall trials, subjects first studied the map for two minutes, attempting to learn as much of the map as they could. After the two minutes, subjects drew from memory as much of the map as they could remember. While subjects studied the map, they thought out loud about what they were looking at on the map, what techniques they were using to learn the information, what information they thought they had yet to learn, how they were deciding to change study strategies, and so on. By analyzing these verbal protocols for the set of "procedures", or study techniques, that subjects were using, we were able to relate speed of learning over trials to the set of study procedures subjects employed.

Three general types of procedures emerged from the protocols: attention, encoding, and evaluation. Attentional procedures included those by which subjects selected subsets of the map information on which to focus and those by which they decided the sequence of map elements to study. Encoding procedures included techniques for holding current information in working memory and techniques for elaborating the information and storing it in long-term memory for later retrieval. Predictably, the procedures that emerged from the protocols for encoding spatial information were different from those used to encode verbal information. The evaluation procedure comprised subjects' statements of whether or not they felt they had successfully learned the information on which they were currently focusing.

A comparison of the protocols of fast and slow learners revealed at least one difference in the use of procedures in each of the three categories. Good learners controlled their focus of attention on the map by isolating subsets of information and systematically learning

the information in each subset before moving to a new one. Poor learners used more haphazard and unsystematic approaches to selecting information to learn. Good learners were more accurate in their self-evaluations of what they knew or did not know than poor learners. Further, when they decided that they did not yet know certain information, they were more likely to immediately attempt to learn that information than poor learners. Finally, and most importantly, good and poor learners differed in the encoding procedures they used to actually learn the information on the map. While both good and poor learners were successful at learning the verbal information on the maps, good learners were far superior at learning the spatial information. They used a variety of techniques for learning spatial shapes and relationships, including visual imagery, encoding explicit spatial relationships between pairs of map objects (e.g., "the church is west of the fire station"), and naming a complex spatial configuration as a cue for reproduction of the shapes later (e.g., "this set of roads looks like a stick man running to the west"). In contrast, poor learners were unable to learn much of the spatial information and used far fewer spatial learning procedures.

While the major difference between good and poor learners was in their success at learning spatial information, the relationship between performance and the use of study procedures was correlational. Thus, it was not clear that the use of effective learning procedures was the underlying determinant of the superior performance of good learners. Therefore, in another experiment, Stasz and I manipulated the procedures subjects used in order to assess directly the influence of particular procedures on learning success. We divided a sample of

subjects into three groups and gave each group a map to learn using their own techniques, as in the first experiment. We then trained the first group to use a set of six procedures that had been highly correlated with learning success in the previous experiment. Three of these procedures were techniques for learning spatial information and included instruction in the use of visual imagery. The second group received training on six procedures that were uncorrelated with success in the first experiment. The third group received no training. Subjects then studied a second map on which they were instructed to use the procedures they had been taught. The group instructed in the use of the effective procedures improved their performance significantly more than the other two groups, indicating that the use of effective procedures contributed directly to subjects' learning success.

We also assessed the basic visual ability of all subjects by administering a psychometric test of visual memory. Essentially, this test measured subjects' ability to create, maintain, and retrieve a visual image in memory. We reasoned that the ability to encode visual information in memory might influence the benefit subjects derived from training in the use of spatial learning procedures. An analysis of the post-training performance of subjects in the effective procedures group indicated that visual memory ability did influence learning performance on the second map. In general, the higher a subject's visual memory ability, the greater the improvement in performance over the first map. For subjects of high and medium ability, the extent of the improvement was significantly greater than for the subjects in the other two training groups. However, low-ability

subjects improved no more than subjects in the other groups, indicating that they benefited little from the effective-procedures training. Thus, both people's basic skills at using spatial information and the discretionary study techniques they employ play important roles in their spatial cognition.

#### CONCLUDING COMMENTS

In surveying some of the current research in spatial reasoning being conducted by cognitive psychologists, I have been motivated by two goals. The first goal has been to present and attempt to defend a few of the hypotheses about human spatial cognition that guide my research. In summary, these hypotheses are that (1) people have and use a variety of types of spatial knowledge, (2) the type of knowledge people have about a region depends on the nature of their experiences with the region, (3) for many spatial reasoning tasks, performance is constrained by the type of knowledge available to the individual, and (4) people's low-level spatial processing skills may limit the available forms of knowledge representation and task performance. The second goal has been to attempt to narrow the gap between the concerns of cognitive and environmental psychologists studying spatial reasoning. Historically, this gap seems to have resulted primarily from differences in problem domain and in methodology. While environmental psychologists have, by and large, investigated real-world problems using observational or correlational methodologies, cognitive psychologists have traditionally conducted experimental studies of performance on simplified laboratory tasks. Although some of the tasks discussed in the previous sections used stimulus materials that were

specially constructed for the experiments, the tasks themselves represented activities that people normally perform when learning and reasoning in their environment. In addition, an attempt was made to illustrate some alternative research paradigms that appear promising in the study of cognitive aspects of spatial behavior, including correlational methods such as protocol analysis used in conjunction with experimental studies. Inasmuch as the study of human spatial behavior is a growing concern in both disciplines, the exchange of knowledge across disciplines is clearly in the interest of researchers in both fields.

REFERENCE NOTES

Thorndyke, P., & Hayes-Roth, B. Spatial knowledge acquisition from maps and navigation. Paper presented at Psychonomics Society Meetings, San Antonio, Texas, 1978.

REFERENCES

- Allen, G. L., Siegel, A. W., & Rosinski, R. R. The role of perceptual context in structuring spatial knowledge. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1978, 4, 617-630.
- Appleyard, D. Why buildings are known. Environment and Behavior, 1969, 1, 131-156.
- Appleyard, D. Styles and methods of structuring a city. Environment and Behavior, 1970, 2, 100-118.
- Chase, W. Map reading ability. In J. Harvey (Ed.), Cognition, social behavior, and the environment. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers, 1980.
- Clayton, K. Acquisition and utilization of spatial knowledge. In J. Harvey (Ed.), Cognition, social behavior, and the environment. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers, 1980.
- Downs, R., & Stea, D. (Eds.), Image and environment. Chicago: Aldine, 1973.
- Downs, R. & Stea, D. Maps in minds. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.
- Golledge, R. G., & Rushton, G. (Eds.), Spatial choice and spatial behavior. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1976.
- Kozlowski, L. T., & Bryant, K. J. Sense of direction, spatial orientation, and cognitive maps. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1977, 3, 590-598.
- Lynch, K. The image of a city. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1960.
- Moore, T. T., & Golledge, R. G. (Eds.), Environmental knowing. Stroudsburg, Pa.: Dowden, Hutchinson & Rose, 1976.
- Piaget, J., Inhelder, B., & Szeminska, A. The child's conception of geometry. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Proshansky, H., Ittelson, W., & Rivlin, L. Environmental psychology: Man and his physical setting. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1970.
- Shemyakin, F. N. Orientation in space. In B. G. Ananyev et al. (Eds.), Psychological science in the USSR (Vol. 1, Pt. 1). U.S. Office of Technical Reports (#11466), 1962.

- Siegel, A. W., Kirasic, K. C., & Kail, R. V. Stalking the elusive cognitive map: The development of children's representations of geographic space. In J. F. Wohlwill & I. Altman (Eds.), Human behavior and environment: Children and the environment (Vol. 3). New York: Plenum, 1978.
- Siegel, A. W., & White, S. H. The development of spatial representations of large-scale environments. In H. W. Reese (Ed.), Advances in child development and behavior (Vol. 10). New York: Academic Press, 1975.
- Stevens, A., & Coupe, P. Distortions in judged spatial relations. Cognitive Psychology, 1978, 10, 422-437.
- Thorndyke, P. Distance estimation from cognitive maps. R-2474-ONR, The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California, 1979.
- Thorndyke, P., & Stasz, C. Individual differences in procedures for knowledge acquisition from maps. Cognitive Psychology, 1980, 12, 137-175.
- Tolman, E. C. Cognitive maps in rats and men. Psychological Review, 1948, 55, 189-208.
- Trowbridge, C. C. Fundamental methods of orientation and "imaginary maps." Science, 1913, 38, 888-897.
- Witkin, H. A. Studies in geographic orientation. Yearbook of the American Philosophical Society, 1946, 152-155.



## SPECIAL COPIES PER THE CLIENT

1	Office of Naval Research Code 1021P Department of the Navy Arlington, VA	22217	6
2	Scientific Officer Director, Personnel & Training Research Programs, Psychological Sciences Division Office of Naval Research Department of the Navy Arlington, VA	22217	
	FOR Mr. Henry M. Halff		
3	Administrative Contracting Officer Office of Naval Research Arlington, VA	22217	
	FOR Mr. W. Grant		
4	4000-28500 Chief Scientist Office of Naval Research Branch Office Pasadena, California	91106	
	FOR Dr. Eugene E. Glove		
5	4000-29000 Naval Research Laboratory Library (Code 2627)		6
6	Office of Naval Research Code 200 Arlington, VA	22217	6
7	1300-01000 Defense Technical Information Center		12

## DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

8	Psychologist Office of Naval Research Branch 223 Old Marylebone Road London NW 15th ENGLAND		
---	---	--	--

- 9 Psychologist  
ONR Branch Office  
1030 East Green Street  
Pasadena, CA 91101
- 10 4100-18000 Naval Postgraduate School  
Attn: Library (Code 1424)  
  
FOR Dr. Jack R. Borsting  
FOR Dr. Gary Poock
- 11 4100-18500 U.S. Naval War College  
Attn: Director of Libraries  
  
FOR Maj. Jack A. Thorpe
- 12 4100-10500 U.S. Naval Training Equipment Ctr.  
Orlando, Florida 32813  
  
FOR Dr. Robert Breaux
- 13 Psychologist  
ONR Branch Office  
536 S. Clark Street  
Chicago, IL 60605
- 14 Personnel & Training Research Prqms.  
Office of Naval Research (Code 458)  
Arlington, VA 22217
- 15 Naval Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152  
  
FOR Dr. Robert Blanchard  
FOR Dr. Michael Sorensen  
FOR Dr. Pat Federico  
FOR Dr. James McGrath, Code 306  
FOR Dr. William Montague  
FOR A. A. Sjöholm, Code 201  
FOR Dr. John Ford  
FOR Library
- 16 Naval Medical R&D Command (Code 44)  
National Naval Medical Center  
Bethesda, MD 20014

- 17 4000-35200 Head, Research, Development &  
Studies Branch (OP-102)  
Deputy Chief of Naval Operations  
(Manpower, Personnel & Training)
- 18 Naval Aerospace Medical Research  
Laboratory  
Pensacola, FL 32508  
  
FOR Lt. Franck C. Petho MSC Ph.D. L51  
FOR Roger W. Remington, Ph.D. L52
- 19 Dr. Norman J. Kerr  
Chief of Naval Technical Training  
Naval Air Station Memphis (75)  
Millington, TN 38054
- 20 Psychologist  
ONR Branch Office  
495 Summer Street  
Boston, MA 02210
- 21 Dr. William L. Maloy  
Principal Civilian Advisory for  
Education & Training  
Naval Training Command, Code 00A  
Pensacola, FL 32508
- 22 4000-35100 Scientific Advisor to the Deputy  
Chief of Naval Operations  
(Manpower, Personnel & Training)/  
Chief of Naval Personnel  
  
FOR Dr. Kneale Marshall
- 23 Capt. Richard L. Martin  
Prospective Commanding Officer  
USS Care Vinson (C-N-70)  
Newport News Shipbuilding &  
Dry Dock  
Newport News, VA 23607
- 24 Dr. George Moeller  
Head, Human Factors Branch  
Naval Submarine Medical Research Lab  
Groton, CT 06340

- 25 John Olsen  
Chief of Naval Education and  
Training Support  
Pensacola, FL 32509
- 26 Dr. Richard A. Pollack  
Academic Computing Center  
U.S. Naval Academy  
Annapolis, MD 21402
- 27 4000-22000 Information Systems (ONR-437)  
Office, Assistant Chief for Research  
Office of Naval Research
- 28 Scientific Director  
Office of Naval Research  
Scientific Liaison Group/Tokyo  
American Embassy  
APO San Francisco 96503
- 29 Mr. Arnold I. Rubinstein  
Naval Personnel Support Techn.  
Naval Materiel Command (08T244)  
Room 1044, Crystal Plaza #5  
2221 Jefferson Davis Highway  
Arlington, VA 20360
- 30 Dr. Worth Scanland  
Chief of Naval Education and  
Training  
Code N-5  
Naval Air Station  
Pensacola, FL 32508
- 31 4000-34000 Director, R&D Plans Div. (NOP-987)  
Office of Research, Development,  
Test & Evaluation  
Office, Chief of Naval Operations  
  
FOR Mr. Robert Smith (NOP-987E)
- 32 Dr. Alfred P. Smode  
Training Analysis & Evaluation  
Group (TAEG)  
Department of the Navy  
Orlando, FL 32813

33 4100-0900J Technical Information Division  
(Code 81331)  
Naval Air Development Center  
Warminster, Pennsylvania 18974  
  
FOR Lt. Steven D. Harris, MSC

## DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

34 Technical Director  
USA Human Engineering Labs  
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005

35 Office, DCS/Operations  
USAREUR Director of GED  
Hq. USAREUR & 7th Army  
APO New York 09403

36 Training Effectiveness Analysis Div.  
U.S. Army TRADOC Systems Analysis  
Activity  
White Sands Missile Range, NM 88002

FOR Lt. Col. Gary Bloedorn

37 USA Engineering Topographical Lab  
(ETL-GS-P)  
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060

38 U.S. Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

FOR Dr. Ralph Dusek  
FOR Dr. Ed Johnson  
FOR Dr. Milton S. Katz  
FOR Dr. Harold F. O'Neil, Jr.  
FOR Dr. Joseph Ward  
FOR Dr. Beatrice J. Farr  
FOR Col. Frank Hart  
FOR Dr. Michael Kaplan  
FOR Dr. Robert Sasnor

## DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

39 2203-0400J Requirements, Programs & Studies  
Group (AF/ADQM)  
Office, DCS/Research, Development  
and Acquisition

- 40 2303-85700 Advanced Systems Division (AS)  
Air Force Human Resources  
Laboratory, AFSC  
  
FOR Dr. G. A. Eckstrand
- 41 Dr. Genevieve Haddad  
Air Force Office of Scientific  
Research, NL, Building 410  
Bolling AFB  
Washington, DC 20332
- 42 2303-36100 AF Human Resources Laboratory, AFSC  
Technical Training Division  
Lowry AFB, Colorado 80230  
  
FOR Dr. Mary Bockway
- 43 2303-36200 Operational Training Division (OT)  
AF Human Resources Laboratory, AFSC  
Williams AFB, Arizona 85224  
  
FOR CDR. Mercer
- 44 2306-02000 Director  
Air University Library  
  
FOR Retention  
FOR Lt. Col. Brian K. Waters
- 45 Chief, Instructional Technology Br  
AF Human Resources Laboratory  
Lowry AFB, CO 80230
- 46 Dr. Earl A. Alluisi  
AF Human Resources Laboratory  
Brooks AFB, TX 78235
- 47 Faculty Development Division  
Hq. Sheppard Technical Training  
Center, ATC  
Sheppard AFB, TX 76311

## DEPARTMENT OF THE MARINES

- 48 H. William Greenup  
Education Advisor (E031)  
Education Center  
Hq. Marine Corps  
Quantico, VA 22134

- 49 Dr. A. L. Slafkosky  
Scientific Advisor (Code RD-1)  
Hq. U.S. Marine Corps  
Washington, DC 20380
- 50 Special Assistant for Marine  
Corps Matters  
Code 100M  
Office of Naval Research  
300 N. Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217
- 51 Maj. Jack Wallace  
Hq. Marine Corps  
OTTI 31  
Arlington Annex  
Columbia Pike at Arlington Ridge Rd  
Arlington, VA 20380
- 52 Mr. Richard Lanterman  
Psychological Research  
(G-P-1/62)  
U.S. Coast Guard  
Washington, D.C. 20590

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

- 53 1100-05000 Defense Advanced Research Projects  
Agency  
  
FOR Dr. Craig Fields  
FOR Dr. Dexter Fletcher
- 54 1150-00600 Central Reference Division  
Defense Intelligence Agency  
Attn: RTS-6B2A 4
- 55 Military Assistant for Training  
and Personnel Technology  
Office of the Under Secretary of  
Defense for Research & Engineering  
Washington, DC 20301
- 56 Mr. Armando Mancini  
Hqs. Defense Mapping Agency  
Building 56  
Naval Observatory  
Massachusetts Avenue at 34th St NW  
Washington, DC 20390

## OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

- 57 5700-02000 Department of State  
INR Communications Center  
  
FOR Retention 5  
FOR INR/XR/RRD
- 58 5800-61000 Central Intelligence Agency  
  
FOR Dr. Joseph Markowitz
- 59 5900-18000 Library of Congress  
Program Manager, CIP Program
- 60 5900-15000 National Science Foundation  
  
FOR Dr. Joseph Lipson  
FOR Dr. Andrew R. Molnar  
FOR Dr. Joseph L. Young
- 61 National Institute of Education  
1200 - 19th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20208  
  
FOR Dr. John Mays  
FOR Dr. Susan Chipman  
FOR Dr. Arthur Melmed
- 62 Dr. Frank Withrow  
U.S. Office of Education  
400 - 6th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20202

## ADDITIONAL ADDRESSES

- 63 Dr. John R. Anderson  
Department of Psychology  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
- 64 Dr. John Annett  
Department of Psychology  
University of Warwick  
Coventry CV4 7AL  
ENGLAND



- 65 Dr. Michael Atwood  
Science Applications Institute  
40 Denver Tech. Center West  
7935 E. Prentice Avenue  
Englewood, Colorado 80110
- 66 1 Psychological Research Unit  
Dept. of Defense (Army Office)  
Campbell Park Office  
Canberra, ACT 2600  
AUSTRALIA
- 67 Dr. Alan Baddeley  
Medical Research Council  
Applied Psychology Unit  
Department of Psychology  
Brown University  
Providence, RI 02912
- 68 Dr. Patricia Baggett  
Department of Psychology  
University of Denver  
University Park  
Denver, CO 80208
- 69 Mr. Avron Barr  
Department of Computer Science  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305
- 70 Professor Harry Beilin  
The Graduate School & University  
Center of the City University  
of New York  
Developmental Psychology  
33 West 42nd Street  
New York, NY 10036
- 71 Dr. Nicholas A. Bond  
Dept. of Psychology  
Sacramento State College  
600 Jay Street  
Sacramento, California 95819
- 72 Dr. Lyle Bourne  
Department of Psychology  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, Colorado 80302

- 73 Dr. Kenneth Bowles  
Institute for Information Sciences  
University of California  
La Jolla, CA 92037
- 74 Elaine Boulay  
Institute of Human Learning  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720
- 75 Ann Brown  
Center for the Study of Reading  
51 Gerty Drive  
University of Illinois  
Champaign, IL 61820
- 76 Dr. John S. Brown  
Xerox Palo Alto Research Center  
3333 Coyote Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304
- 77 Dr. Bruce Buchanan  
Department of Computer Science  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305
- 78 Dr. C. Victor Bunderson  
WICAT Inc.  
University Plaza, Suite 10  
1160 South State Street  
Orem, UT 84057
- 79 Louise Carter-Saltzman  
Department of Psychology  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98195
- 80 Charles Myers Library  
Livingstone House  
Livingstone Road  
Stratford, England E15 2LJ  
ENGLAND
- 81 Dr. William Chase  
Department of Psychology  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

- 82 Dr. Micheline Chi  
Learning R&D Center  
University of Pittsburgh  
3939 O'Hara Street  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
- 83 Dr. William Clancey  
Department of Computer Science  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305
- 84 Keith Clayton  
Vanderbilt University  
Department of Psychology  
Nashville, TN 37240
- 85 Anabel Cohen  
University of Toronto  
Scarborough College  
1265 Military Trail  
West Hill, Ontario  
CANADA
- 86 Dr. Allan M. Collins  
Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc.  
50 Moulton Street  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
- 87 Dr. Meredith P. Crawford  
American Psychological Association  
1200 - 17th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036
- 88 Mr. Ken Cross  
Anacapa Sciences, Inc.  
P. O. Drawer Q  
Santa Barbara, CA 93102
- 89 Dr. Hubert Dreyfus  
Department of Psychology  
University of California  
Berkeley, California 94720
- 90 Gary Evans  
The Program in Social Ecology  
University of California  
Irvine, CA 92717

- 91 Major I. N. Evonic  
Canadian Forces Pers. Applied  
Research  
1107 Avenue Road  
Toronto, Ontario  
CANADA
- 92 Dr. Ed Feigenbaum  
Dept. of Computer Science  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California 94305
- 93 Dr. Victor Fields  
Dept. of Psychology  
Montgomery College  
Rockville, Maryland 20850
- 94 Dr. Edwin A. Fleishman  
Advanced Research Resources Orgn.  
4330 East West Highway, Suite 900  
Washington, D. C. 20014
- 95 Dr. John R. Frederiksen  
Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc.  
50 Moulton Street  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
- 96 Mr. Wallace Feurzeig  
Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc.  
50 Moulton Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138
- 97 Baruch Fischhoff  
Decision Research  
A Branch of Perceptronics  
1201 Oak Street  
Eugene, OR 97401
- 98 Dr. John D. Polley, Jr.  
Applied Sciences Associates Inst.  
Valencia, PA 16059
- 99 Dr. Alinda Friedman  
Department of Psychology  
University of Alberta  
Edmonton, Alberta  
CANADA T6G 2J9

- 100 Michael Friendly  
Department of Psychology  
York University  
4700 Keele Street  
Downsview, Toronto  
CANADA M3J 1P3
- 101 H. Gardner  
Psychology Section  
Veterans Administration Hospital  
150 S. Huntington Avenue  
Boston, MA 02130
- 102 Dr. Edward Geiselman  
Department of Psychology  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90024
- 103 Dr. Deidre Gentner  
Bolt, Beranek & Newman  
50 Moulton Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138
- 104 Dr. Robert Glaser  
LRDC  
University of Pittsburgh  
3939 O'Hara Street  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
- 105 Dr. Marvin Glock  
Department of Education  
Stone Hall  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, NY 14853
- 106 Dr. Ira Goldstein  
Xerox Palo Alto Research Center  
3333 Coyote Road  
Palo Alto, California 94304
- 107 Dr. James G. Greeno  
LRDC  
University of Pittsburgh  
3939 O'Hara Street  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

- 108 James P. Heyman  
Washington University  
Department of Psychology  
St. Louis, MO 63130
- 109 Dr. Adrian Hill  
Vision and Ergonomics Research  
Glasgow College of Technology  
Cowcaddens Road  
Glasgow G4 0BA  
SCOTLAND
- 110 Dr. Dave Hintzman  
Department of Psychology  
University of Oregon  
Eugene, OR 97403
- 111 William Hirst  
The Rockefeller University  
66th Street and York Avenue  
New York, NY 10021
- 112 Howard Hock  
Department of Psychology  
Florida Atlantic University  
Boca Raton, FL 33141
- 113 Library  
HUMPRO/Western Division  
27857 Berwick Drive  
Carmel, California 93921
- 114 Dr. Earl Hunt  
Dept. of Psychology  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington 98105
- 115 Dr. Kay Inaba  
21116 Vanowen Street  
Canoqa Park, CA 91303
- 116 Dr. Lawrence B. Johnson  
Lawrence Johnson & Assn., Inc.  
Suite 502  
2001 S Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20009

- 117 Dr. Arnold F. Kaurick  
Honeywell, Inc.  
2600 Ridgeway Pkwy  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413
- 118 Stephen Kerst  
The Boys Town Center for the  
Study of Youth Development  
The Catholic University of America  
Washington, DC 20064
- 119 Dr. Walter Kintsch  
Department of Psychology  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, Colorado 80302
- 120 Dr. David Kieras  
Department of Psychology  
University of Arizona  
Tucson, Arizona 85721
- 121 Dr. Kenneth Klivington  
Alfred P. Sloan Foundation  
630 Fifth Avenue  
New York, New York 10020
- 122 Dr. Steve Kosslyn  
Department of Psychology  
Harvard University  
William James Hall  
33 Kirkland Street  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
- 123 Dr. Eli Kozminsky  
Department of Psychology  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, CO 80302
- 124 Mr. Marlin Kroger  
1117 Via Goleta  
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274
- 125 Judith F. Kroll  
Institute for Cognitive Studies  
Rutgers--The State University  
Newark, NJ 07102

- 126 Lt. Col. C.R.J. Lafleur  
Personnel Applied Research  
National Defense Hqs  
101 Colonel By Drive  
Ottawa  
CANADA K1A 0K2
- 127 Dr. Jill Larkin  
Department of Psychology  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- 128 Dr. Alan Lesgold  
Learning R&D Center  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
- 129 Dr. Robert A. Levit  
Manager, Behavioral Sciences  
The BDM Corporation  
7915 Jones Branch Drive  
McLean, VA 22101
- 130 Colin MacLeod  
Department of Psychology  
University of Toronto  
Toronto  
CANADA
- 131 Dr. Mark Miller  
Systems & Info Sciences Laboratory  
Central Research Laboratories  
Texas Instruments, Inc.  
Mail Station 5  
P. O. Box 5936  
Dallas, TX 75222
- 132 Dr. Richard B. Millward  
Dept. of Psychology  
Hunter Lab.  
Brown University  
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
- 133 Robert S. Moyer  
Department of Psychology  
Bates College  
Lewiston, ME 04240



- 134 Dr. Allen Munro  
University of Southern California  
Behavioral Technical Laboratories  
1845 S. Elena Avenue, 4th Floor  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
- 135 Tom Nelson  
Department of Psychology  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98195
- 136 Dr. Donald A. Norman  
Dept. of Psychology C-009  
University of California  
La Jolla, California 92093
- 137 Dr. Gary Olson  
Human Performance Center  
University of Michigan  
330 Packard Road  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
- 138 Professor Dean H. Owen  
Department of Psychology  
The Ohio State University  
404-C West Seventeenth Avenue  
Columbus, OH 43210
- 139 Dr. Robert Pichella  
Department of Psychology  
Human Performance Center  
330 Packard Road  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
- 140 Mr. Luigi Petrullo  
2431 N. Edgewood Street  
Arlington, Virginia 22207
- 141 Katy Pezlek  
Department of Psychology  
California State College  
5500 State College Parkway  
San Bernardino, CA 92407
- 142 Dr. Peter Polson  
Dept. of Psychology  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, Colorado 80302

- 143 Dr. Peter B. Read  
Social Science Research Council  
605 Third Avenue  
New York, New York 10016
- 144 Celia C. Reaves  
Cornell University  
Uris Hall - Psychology  
Ithaca, NY 14853
- 145 Dr. Fred Reif  
SESAME  
c/o Physics Department  
University of California  
Berkeley, California 94720
- 146 Mr. Steven Rogers  
Anacapa Sciences, Inc.  
P. O. Drawer Q  
Santa Barbara, CA 93102
- 147 Dr. Andrew M. Rose  
American Institutes for Research  
1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20007
- 148 Dr. Ernst Z. Rothkopf  
Bell Laboratories  
600 Mountain Avenue  
Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974
- 149 Dr. B. G. Rule  
Department of Psychology  
University of Alberta  
Edmonton, Alberta  
CANADA T6G 2E9
- 150 Dr. David Rumelhart  
Center for Human Information  
University of California  
La Jolla, CA 92093
- 151 Liz Bauer-Nilsen Sanders  
Ohio State University  
Human Performance Center  
404-B West 17th Avenue  
Columbus, OH 43210

- 152 Dr. Walter Schneider  
Dept. of Psychology  
University of Illinois  
Champaign, Illinois 61820
- 153 Dr. Allen Schoenfeld  
Department of Mathematics  
Hamilton College  
Clinton, NY 13323
- 154 Dr. Robert Seidel  
Instructional Technology Group  
HumRRO  
300 N. Washington Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314
- 155 Dr. Robert Smith  
Department of Computer Sciences  
Rutgers University  
New Brunswick, NJ 08903
- 156 Dr. Richard Snow  
School of Education  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California 94305
- 157 Professor Robert L. Solso  
University of Idaho  
College of Letters & Science  
Department of Psychology  
Moscow, ID 83843
- 158 Dr. Kathryn T. Spoehr  
Department of Psychology  
Brown University  
Providence, RI 02912
- 159 Robert Stanley  
Yale University  
Department of Psychology  
2 Hillhouse Avenue  
New Haven, CT 06520
- 160 Dr. Robert Sternberg  
Dept. of Psychology  
Yale University  
Box 11A, Yale Station  
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

- 161 Dr. Albert Stevens  
Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc.  
50 Moulton Street  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
- 162 Dr. Thomas Sticht  
HUMERO  
300 N. Washington Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314
- 163 Dr. David Stone  
ED 236  
State University of New York  
Albany, NY 12222
- 164 Dr. Patrick Suppes  
Institute for Mathematical  
Studies in the Social Sciences  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California 94305
- 165 Michael Tarka  
Vanderbilt University  
Department of Psychology  
Nashville, TN 37240
- 166 Shelley Taylor  
UCLA  
405 Hilgard  
Los Angeles, CA 90024
- 167 Dr. John Thomas  
IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Inst.  
P. O. Box 218  
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598
- 168 Dr. Douglas Towne  
Behavioral Technology Labs.  
University of Southern California  
1845 S. Elena Avenue, 4th Floor  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
- 169 Dr. J. Uhlaner  
Perceptronic, Inc.  
6271 Variel Avenue  
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

- 170 Dr. Benton J. Underwood  
Dept. of Psychology  
Northwestern University  
Evanston, Illinois 60201
- 170A University of Lethbridge  
Department of Psychology  
c/o J. Don Read  
Lethbridge, Alberta  
CANADA
- 171 Dr. James Voss  
Department of Psychology  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, CO 80302
- 172 R. Weber  
Department of Psychology  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, OK 74074
- 173 C. P. Whaley  
Department 7270  
Bell Northern Research  
P. O. Box 3511, Station C  
Ottawa, Ontario  
CANADA K1Y 4H7
- 174 Leslie Whitaker  
University of Missouri  
Department of Psychology  
8001 Natural Bridge Road  
St. Louis, MO 63121
- 175 Charles W. White  
Program in Visual Perception  
New School for Social Research  
65 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10003
- 176 J. W. Whitlow, Jr.  
The Rockefeller University  
1230 York Avenue  
New York, NY 10021
- 177 Dr. William B. Whitten, II  
Department of Psychology  
SUNY Albany  
1400 Washington Avenue  
Albany, NY 12222

- 178 Dr. Christopher Wickens  
Department of Psychology  
University of Illinois  
Champaign, IL 61820
- 179 Jay L. Wright  
Department of Psychology NI-25  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98195
- 180 Dr. Karl Zinn  
Center for Research on Learning  
and Teaching  
University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

180 ADDRESSES  
244 TOTAL COPIES